

REMARKS:

By the foregoing Amendment B, applicant responds fully to the Office Action dated August 18, 2006. Claims 6 and 11 have been cancelled by the present amendment. Claims 7-10 and 12 and 15 have been amended by the present amendment. Claims 5, 7-10 and 12-15 remain pending in the above-noted application.

Claims 1-4 have been previously canceled.

Applicant notes the allowance of Claim 5.

Claim 6 stand rejected, and is canceled by the present amendment.

The Examiner indicates that Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been amended by the present amendment to be rewritten in independent form and include all of the limitations of the base claim (canceled claim 6). There were no intervening claims between Claims 7 and 6. It is therefore believed that Claim 7, as amended, is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahler. Claims 8 and 9 have been amended by the present amendment to depend from Claim 7 rather than Claim 6. Claim 7 is now believed to be allowable. It is therefore believed that Claims 8 and 9, as amended, are now allowable as well.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs. Claim 10 has been amended by the present amendment to replace "brush" with "handle." Claim 10, as amended, is now believed to comply with the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim 10 stands further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahler. Claim 10 depends from Claim 9, which is now believed to be allowable. It is therefore believed that Claim 10, as amended, is now allowable as well.

Claim 11 stands rejected, and is canceled by the present amendment.

5       The Examiner indicates that Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 12 has been amended by the present amendment to be rewritten in independent form and include all of the limitations of the base claim (canceled claim 11). There were no intervening claims  
10   between Claims 12 and 11. It is therefore believed that Claim 12, as amended, is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 12, and were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (previously Claim 11, which is now canceled). Claim 12 is now the base claim from which Claims 13 and 14 depend. Claim 12 is now  
15   believed to be in condition for allowance. It is therefore believed that Claims 13 and 14 are now in condition for allowance as well, without further amendment.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahler. Claim 15 has been amended by the present amendment to depend from Claim 12 rather than Claim 11. Since Claim 12 is believed to be allowable, it is believed that Claim 15 is  
20   now allowable as well.

In summary, Applicant responds fully to the Office Action dated August 18, 2006. Applicant believes that the present application containing claims 5, 7-10, and 12-15 is in condition for allowance. Favorable action to that end respectfully requested.

5

Signed at Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, this 18 day of October, 2006.

10

Respectfully Submitted,

15



Nicholas A. Brannen  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 51,224

20 104 South Main Street, Suite 300  
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54935  
Telephone: 920-322-9130  
Fax: 920-322-9131  
nab@brannenlawoffice.com

25